

JUL 26 2006 Serial No. 10/086,104

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly  
5 assisted Applicant in responding.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 103.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves  
10 or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over  
15 Gutman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,768 ("Purpura"). In order to describe the invention with greater clarity, claim 1 is amended to describe: "responsive to said generating said authentication result, means for distributing and caching said authentication result on at least one of said authentication servers registered in said distributed network." Support for the amendment is found in U.S. published application  
20 no. 2003/0163730 at paragraph 0031, lines 13-14.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Purpura of "caching said authentication result on at least one of said authentication servers registered in said distributed network." Purpura does describe an authentication cookie (col. 3, line 51-59). Purpura describes that the authentication cookie is transmitted to the user's computer (col. 3,  
25 line 64). Purpura also describes that the server issuing the authentication cookie provides a second server with the public key used to encrypt the authentication cookie. (col. 4, line 4-15). However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the authentication cookie (authentication result) is cached on the second server. Gutman adds nothing to Purpura. Accordingly, the combination of Gutman and Purpura provides no teaching  
30 or suggestion of "caching said authentication result on at least one of said authentication servers registered in said distributed network." Therefore, the present rejection of claim 1 is deemed to be overcome. In view of their dependence from an

Serial No. 10/086,104

allowable base claim, the dependents of claim 1 are deemed to be allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

The remaining independent claims have been similarly amended.

5 Therefore, the present rejections of the remaining independent claims are deemed to be overcome. In view of their dependence from an allowable base claims, the remaining dependents are deemed to be allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

### CONCLUSION

10

Based on the foregoing, the application is deemed to be in allowable condition. As such, Applicant earnestly requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400, should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application.

15

Respectfully Submitted,



20

Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862